REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 03/18/08, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 are pending. As noted above, a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.78(a)(3) is also being submitted concurrently with this response to request that the present application be made a continuation-in-part (CIP) application of Application No. 10/269,922.

In the Office Action mailed 03/18/08, the Examiner has objected to the specification and rejected all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and second paragraph. Applicant submits that the various text noted by the Examiner for the objection and rejections have been deleted in this amendment. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and second paragraph.

The Examiner has also rejected all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sano et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0105828; "Sano"). Applicant submits that if and when the above-referenced petition is granted, the rejection becomes moot, since Sano will be the parent application to the present application. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §102(e), when the petition is granted.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. Patent 6,470,429; "Jones") in view of Anand (U.S. Patent 6,134,641). In response, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection and the Examiner's reasoning thereof, especially in light of the amendment to the pending claims. Applicant has amended the pending claims and independent claims 1 and 10 now claim data access through multiple nodes in which a first data processing system forms a first node and includes a first bridge and a memory local to the first node. A second data processing system forms a second node and includes a second bridge. When the second node receives a request from an external source to access a coherent fabric of the memory, the second bridge identifies the memory as located in a remote node and transfers the request as an uncacheable access

request to the first node, so that the uncacheable access request does not access the coherent fabric in the second node. When the first bridge receives the uncacheable access request, the first bridge identifies the memory as a local access in the first node and processes the uncacheable access request from the second node as a coherent access to access the coherent fabric of the memory in the first node.

Applicant submits that Jones and Anand fail to disclose these aspects of the claimed embodiments of the invention. The Examiner had noted that Jones does not teach the bridge performing an uncacheable access to the coherent memory space, but that Anand teaches using uncacheable request to access a cache coherent memory space. Applicant submits that Anand discloses a reservation of a first region in a noncacheable address space for a virtual peripheral device and then the computer system is then tricked during operating system startup to reserve a second region in a cacheable address space (Anand at col. 2, lines 50-58). However, Anand does not teach the transfer of an access request to a cacheable address through a transferring node (2nd node) as an uncacheable access request and that uncacheable access request is then processed as a coherent access when reaching the home node (1st node) of the memory, which is the target of the access.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims distinguish over Jones and Anand and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicits the Examiner for the allowance of pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16, as amended.

In order to respond to the outstanding office action, Applicant is petitioning for one-month extension of time with payment.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response or the petition, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 06/18/2008

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/
          William W. Kidd
          Reg. No. 31,772
          Phone: (512) 263-1842
          Fax No: (512) 263-1469
          Email:wkidd@texaspatents.com